



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

10/667,203

09/18/2003

Foster D. Hinshaw

3336.1008-001

7168

21005

7590

01/06/2009

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

530 VIRGINIA ROAD

P.O. BOX 9133

CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2167

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/06/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 10/667,203 | Applicant(s) HINSHAW ET AL. | |
| | Examiner KIMBERLY LOVEL | Art Unit 2167 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/14/08 & 8/21/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-14 are rejected.
2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 3 October 2008, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on 14 July 2008 and 21 August 2008 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 8, 9 and 11 are objected to because of the following informalities:
5. Claim 8 recites the limitations "the output FIFO write pointer" and "the present tuple." There are insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in the claim.
6. Claim 9 recites the limitation "the overflow filter bit." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.
7. Claim 9 mentions that a length field is appended to record fragments. Since records have not been previously mentioned, it is unclear if the record fragments are the same as the tuples, a part of the tuple or etc.
8. Claim 11 recites the limitation "the TID mode." There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the

Art Unit: 2167

various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,434,649 to Baker et al (hereafter Baker) in view of US PGPub 2003/0126056 to Hausman et al (hereafter Hausman) in view of US Patent No 5,983,270 to Abraham et al (hereafter Abraham).

Referring to claim 1, Baker discloses a Programmable Streaming Data Processor (PSDP) arranged to perform primitive initial processing functions directly on a set of data (see abstract; column 1, lines 48-58; and Fig 1A, item 100 – the multimedia processor is considered to represent the programmable streaming data processor since it comprises of the same components and is a data processor for streaming which can be programmed), comprising:

a streaming data interface, arranged to receive data from a streaming data source (see column 5, lines 59-68 and Fig 1, items 122 and 132);

a streaming interface First In First Out (FIFO) [first-in-first-out buffer], arranged to temporarily store streaming data from the streaming data interface (see column 17, lines 25-45; column 18, lines 13-22; and Fig 7, item 716 – the interface uses a first-in-first-out buffer; according to the 5th Edition of Microsoft's Computer Dictionary, the

Art Unit: 2167

definition of a buffer states “a region of memory reserved for use as an intermediate repository in which data is temporarily held while waiting to be transferred between two locations or devices”); and

an output First In First Out (FIFO) device, for forming tuples [outgoing data] and temporarily storing them prior to conditionally forwarding them to the Job Processing Unit (see column 18, lines 18-22 and column 30, lines 22-32).

Baker discloses a Programmable Streaming Data Processor (PSDP) which is arranged to perform primitive functions directly on data received from a streaming data interface, however, Baker et al fails to explicitly teach the further limitations of the data engine and the tuple generator.

Hausman discloses a streaming data interface arranged to receive data from a streaming data source [application(s) 122 and database(s) 121] (see [0039], lines 10-15; [0043], lines 15-16), a streaming interface arranged to temporarily store streaming data from the streaming data interface [queue 108] (see [0043], lines 15-16) and the further limitations of a data engine, arranged to receive output data from the streaming interface, determine field boundaries therein, and process fields to select one or more fields to be assembled into output tuples, the data engine also containing logic arranged to determine whether an output tuple is to be selected for further processing by additional processing Job Processing Units (JPUs) and to assert a use or lose decision value according to that determination [re-ordering, deleting, editing and/or adding elements] (see [0045]; [0048]; and [0057]); and an output device arranged to

Art Unit: 2167

temporarily store tuples [data] prior to conditionally forwarding them to the JPU [cache records until users are ready to use them] (see [0071]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to Hausman's method of filtering data as a subcomponent to Baker et al's Data Streamer. One would have been motivated to do so since it is well known to one of ordinary skill that filtering provides customized distribution of data and also decreases that the amount of information sent across the network (Hausman: see [0005]).

While the combination of Baker and Hausman (hereafter Baker/Hausman) discloses a tuple generator, arranged to assemble fields into the output tuple (see [0065]), Baker/Hausman fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein if the use or lose decision value indicates that such the output tuple is to be discarded, to prevent the output tuple from being transferred for further processing by the JPU. Abraham discloses the filtering of data packets, including the further limitation wherein if the use or lose decision value indicates that such the output tuple is to be discarded, to prevent the output tuple from being transferred for further processing by the JPU [allow/deny] (see column 46, line 54 – column 47, line 30).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the concept of filtering the output tuples of Baker/Hausman in the manner disclosed by Abraham. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by limiting the amount of information transferred.

Referring to claim 2, the combination of Baker/Hausman and Abraham (hereafter Baker/Hausman/Abraham) discloses an apparatus as in claim 1 wherein the use or lose value indicates a result from logic processing of fields read from the streaming data interface (Baker: see column 17, line 52 – column 18, line 12; Abraham: see column 46, line 54 – column 47, line 30).

Referring to claim 3, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 1 wherein the use or lose decision value indicates a result from Transaction Identifier (TID) processing (Hausman: see [0063] and [0064]).

Referring to claim 4, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 3 wherein the TID processing and data engine logic execute in parallel (Hausman: see [0063] and [0064]).

Referring to claim 5, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 1 wherein the output tuple is greater in length than an expected predetermined size, and the use or lose decision value is then used to set an overflow field in the output tuple (Baker et al: see column 18, lines 56-64).

Referring to claim 6, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 5 wherein the use or lose decision value is not asserted when a buffer local to the programmable data streaming processor is full; and means for appending an overflow filter bit to a tuple that indicates a transfer of a tuple that should be ignored (Baker: see column 18, lines 56-64).

Referring to claim 7, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 1 additionally comprising: a Direct Memory Access (DMA) interface, coupled to

Art Unit: 2167

the output FIFO, to provide direct access to a memory in the Job Processing Unit (Baker: see column 6, lines 24-25 and column 19, lines 15-25).

Referring to claim 8, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 1 wherein the use or lose value is used to reset the output FIFO write pointer so any prior fields in the present tuple are discarded (Baker: see column 12, lines 18-34 – after the data is written, it is considered to be removed from the temporary storage of the buffer, therefore being deleted).

Referring to claim 9, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 1 wherein the overflow filter bit is inserted in a length field appended to record fragments (Baker: see column 34, lines 56-62).

Referring to claim 10, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 1 wherein an invalid field is appended to a tuple to indicate the results of transaction ID processing (Baker: see column 12, line 62 – column 13, line 16).

Referring to claim 11, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 10 wherein the invalid field indicates that the TID mode marks return tuple (Baker: see column 12, line 62 – column 13, line 16).

Referring to claim 12, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 10 wherein the invalid field indicates that the tuple should not have been returned but the output FIFO overflowed (Baker: see column 31, lines 10-22 and column 34, lines 56-62).

Referring to claim 13, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 1 further comprising: a register reflecting the final PSDP status which is read by

Art Unit: 2167

the CPU to identify whether any overflow or TID status bits are set in any of the tuples (Baker: see column 29, line 63 – column 30, line 21).

Referring to claim 14, Baker/Hausman/Abraham discloses an apparatus as in claim 1 wherein the use or lose decision value represents DeMorgan's Law reduction of multiple instructions (Baker: see column 5, lines 25-34).

Response to Arguments

11. Referring to Applicant's argument on page 9 of the the Remarks, the Applicant states "Neither Baker nor Hausman performs initial pre-processing functions on the data from a data streaming data source."

In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation of "primitive initial processing functions" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

12. Referring to Applicant's argument on pages 10-11 of the the Remarks, the Applicant states "Hausman neither selects fields to be assembled into output tuples nor assembles fields into tuples."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that paragraph [0039] of Hausman discloses the insertion of delimiters between records and between individual elements within records. Paragraph [0045] states "A queue 108 receives and forwards the data stream, API 104 reviews data records included within the stream, as for example by reading data type codes included as elements in the records and comparing them to client and/or subclient request lists; and selects for example by assigning suitable identification tags to the records, or by writing them to a cache, buffer or other ..." Since the output data includes delimiters between records and between elements within the records, and the API 104 reviews the stream in order to be able to compare records and elements within the records to client request lists, Hausman is considered to teach the limitation of "a data engine, arranged to receive output data from the data streaming interface, determine field boundaries therein." Paragraph [0048] of Hausman states "... API 104 formats (or re-formats, i.e., maps, records into any form(s) requested by the individual user(s), as for example by re-ordering, deleting, editing, and/or adding elements within the information strings carried by records." Also, according to [0045], only the records that are requested by the users are sent to that particular user [JPU] for processing. According to [0057], selected data records are mapped and distributed via mapped data streams. Therefore, the reformatting of the records assembles the received data into a records with elements that meet the requirement of the user [process fields to select one or more fields to be assembled into output tuples]. These records are then sent via mapped data streams wherein each user receives only requested records. The concepts of deleting elements from records and not sending

Art Unit: 2167

particular records to particular users is considered to represent the concept of the use or lose decision. The records are considered to represent the tuples since both a tuple and a record equate to a row of data. The record in this instance includes a plurality of elements. Paragraph [0065] of Hausman states "Optionally too records identified for specific user are filtered according to criteria established by users. For example, a given user may wish to see only stock offerings related to IBM issues; all other records of type 'stock offering' would be filtered out of that user's data stream." The concept of filtering is considered to be analogous to the concept of a use or lose decision. As mentioned above, the records are considered to represent tuples.

Thus, Hausman's record is considered to meet the requirement of a tuple. A tuple is a row in a database. In this instance, a record is also considered to represent a row since it consists of many elements.

Furthermore, it is noted that the claim language fails to state that the received data is not previously field delineted.

13. The argument on page 13 of the Remarks stating that Hausman fails to teach a use or lose decision is moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

14. In regards to Applicant's argument on page 14 of the Remarks, the Applicant states that "Hausman does not contain logic; Hausman selects the records based in software."

The examiner respectfully disagrees that software does not meet the requirements of the term logic. When the term logic is given the broadest reasonable definition by one of ordinary skill in the art, it can interpreted as cose or software.

Art Unit: 2167

15. In regards to Applicant's arguments on pages 15-17 of the Remarks that it would not be obvious to combine Baker and Hausman, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

The motivation provided is that Hausman provides the feature of be able to filter data. It is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art that filtering data decreases the amount of data. In this case, the data is being sent across a network and therefore reducing the amount of information of data would reduce for example, the required bandwidth. The results of decreasing the amount of data sent across a network are well known in the art.

16. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 2 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

17. In regards to claims 3 and 4, the applicants state that Baker/Hausman fails to disclose a Transaction Identifier, TID processing and TID processing and data engine logic being executed in parallel. The cited portion of Hausman are paragraphs [0063] and [0064]. The disclosed routing or address tags are considered to represent the TIDs. The records are processed based on these TIDs and the data engine logic utilizes these IDs to determine which records to forward to which users.

18. In regards to claims 5 and 6, the applicants state "Baker/Hausman does not overcome any of the deficiencies of Baker and fails to disclose not asserting the use or lose decision value when a buffer local to the programmable data streaming processor is full; and means for appending an overflow filter bit to a tuple that indicates a transfer of a tuple that should be ignored. The value of the valid bit used in Baker indicates

Art Unit: 2167

whether the specific byte is valid or not. Baker does not, however, not assert a use/lose decision value when a buffer local to the programmable data streaming processor is full and make no use of an overflow filter bit to a tuple that indicates a transfer of a tuple that should be ignored." If the byte is not valid then the processor is considered to be full.

19. In regards to claims 9 and 10, the applicant argues that Baker fails to disclose an overflow filter bit. Hausman discloses parsing the filter which is considered to represent this step.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/Kimberly Lovel/
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

3 January 2009
/kml/

Application/Control Number: 10/667,203
Art Unit: 2167

Page 15